

farming, friends, and food. He started his Angus herd, now the largest in the State, in the late 1950s with the mission of making the perfect steak.

He met his wife, Frosty, when he was only 16 years old. Through their 69 years of marriage, they raised 9 sons and have 32 grandchildren and 31 great-grandchildren to carry on his legacy.

He truly left an impression on everyone he met, and he will be greatly missed by everyone.

ABOLISH THE DEATH PENALTY

(Ms. BUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BUSH. Madam Speaker, St. Louis and I rise today to remind my colleagues that there is no place in a humane society for State-sanctioned violence.

On Tuesday, Kevin “KJ” Johnson was taken from his family by capital punishment. From the systemic racism that tainted his conviction and the State’s continuing use of executions to the Missouri Supreme Court’s and the U.S. Supreme Court’s denial of a stay of execution, KJ was failed by our criminal legal system.

Missouri intends to move forward with the executions of four more people in the coming months. Congress must act. Congress must pass legislation to abolish the Federal death penalty and encourage States to follow suit.

I am also urging our President to continue leading on this issue and act now. Commute the sentences of all those on Federal death row, condemn State executions, and urge his administration, this administration, to stop seeking the death penalty. Let’s abolish the death penalty once and for all.

CONGRATULATING ANDALE HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

(Mr. ESTES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and congratulate the Andale High School Indians on their 2022 Class 3A football State championship, their fourth in a row.

Since 2019, Coach Dylan Schmidt and the class of 2022 have shown the State and country that the hard work and dedication they put into the game are unmatched on the field.

With their win last Saturday, Andale continued its 4-year undefeated streak of 51 games, the second-longest active win streak in the entire country. To put this in perspective, the seniors at Andale High School have never lost a high school football game.

During this impressive run, Andale has outscored their opponents by an average of more than 45 points per game. Coach Schmidt and his team now hold the record for the fourth-longest winning streak in Kansas State history.

In a testament to their talent and Coach Schmidt’s commitment to excellence, the team has only lost twice since 2017.

I hope the entire House will join me in congratulating Andale High School and Coach Schmidt on their monumental achievements on the field and off the field.

I wish them continued success in their upcoming season. Go Indians.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF COLONEL BUD ANDERSON

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, whether in 60 seconds or 60 hours, it is impossible to do justice to the heroism, patriotism, and service that defines the life of Colonel Bud Anderson.

He flew 116 fighter combat missions over Europe in World War II, shot down more than 16 enemy aircraft, and was decorated 25 times, including two Legions of Merit, five Distinguished Flying Crosses, the Bronze Star, 16 air medals, the French Legion of Honor, and the French Croix de Guerre.

Chuck Yeager called him a “mongoose” and “the best fighter pilot I have ever seen.”

After distinguished service in Korea and Vietnam, he managed McDonnell Douglas’ legendary flight facility at Edwards Air Force Base.

He is still going strong at the age of 100, and today, I am pleased to announce, at the request of Congressman LAMALFA and myself, that the Air Force has just promoted him to the rank of Brigadier General, effective December 14.

God bless you, General Anderson. Congratulations, and thank you on behalf of a grateful Nation.

RESTORING AMERICAN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. CLYDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, over the weekend, the White House eased sanctions on Venezuela’s oil sector, permitting Chevron to resume oil production in the communist regime. This policy follows an undeniable pattern of the President putting our Nation last.

Joe Biden is more than happy to green-light drilling in Venezuela but stalls drilling permits here in the United States. He is delighted to beg foreign adversaries like Saudi Arabia to boost production but refuses to unleash American energy. The President is determined to advance Green New Deal policies but fails to help Americans struggling to fill their gas tanks and heat their homes this winter.

Make no mistake: This is the America last administration. You see, President Biden wants to totally control

U.S. fossil fuel energy, and he can do it more easily through manipulating imports of foreign oil than he can over domestic production once it has begun. It is a nefarious plan.

Thankfully, though, in just a few short weeks, House Republicans will retake the majority and start advancing legislation to restore American energy independence once and for all.

WORLD AIDS DAY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, today is World AIDS Day, and lest we forget, it is not over yet.

In 2021, 1.5 million persons became infected with AIDS and 600,000 died; a pandemic or an epidemic. As we fought and scurried to save lives against COVID-19, let us not forget.

I rise to thank all the AIDS advocacy groups and my particular center, the Thomas Street Clinic, which will hold a World AIDS Day ceremony today, one that I never miss except when in Washington.

I remember the days of standing at the bedsides of those who were dying alone. We must continue to research, we must continue to acknowledge, and we must continue to eliminate the stigma, for all of those infected and affected AIDS must have human dignity.

I am reminded of my early engagement standing with the late Senator Orrin Hatch and, of course, the late Senator Ted Kennedy when they announced the Ryan White CARE Treatment Act, and what an amazing impact.

We have lost many souls. Many families have suffered, but as Americans, let us continue to fight against the scourge of AIDS and to embrace those who are fighting and living with AIDS.

World AIDS Day. We should never forget. It is not over yet.

ONE STOP SHOP COMMUNITY REENTRY PROGRAM ACT OF 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1499, I call up the bill (H.R. 3372) to authorize implementation grants to community-based nonprofits to operate one-stop reentry centers, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). Pursuant to House Resolution 1499, the amendment printed in part A of House Report 117-587 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3372

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. COMMUNITY REENTRY CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—The Attorney General is authorized to carry out a grant program to make grants to eligible entities for the purpose of creating community reentry centers.

(b) **APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.**—Each application for a grant under this section shall—

(1) demonstrate a plan to work with community stakeholders who interact with formerly incarcerated people or individuals with a conviction record and their families to—

(A) identify specific strategies and approaches to providing reentry services;

(B) develop a needs assessment tool to survey or conduct focus groups with community members in order to identify—

(i) the needs of individuals after conviction or incarceration, and the barriers such individuals face; and

(ii) the needs of the families and communities to which such individuals belong; and

(C) use the information gathered pursuant to subparagraph (B) to determine the reentry services to be provided by the community reentry center;

(2) identify the institutions from which individuals who are released from incarceration are likely to reenter the community served by the community reentry center, and develop a plan, if feasible, to provide transportation for such released individuals to the community reentry center, to the individual's residence, or to a location where the individual is ordered by a court to report;

(3) demonstrate a plan to provide accessible notice of the location of the reentry intake and coordination center and the services that it will provide (either directly or on a referral basis), including, where feasible, within and outside of institutions identified under paragraph (1);

(4) demonstrate a plan to provide intake and reentry needs assessment that is trauma-informed and gender-responsive after an individual is released from an institution, or, in the case of an individual who is convicted of an offense and not sentenced to a term of imprisonment, after such conviction, and where feasible, before release, to ensure that the individuals served by the center are referred to appropriate reentry services based on the individual's needs immediately upon release from an institution or after conviction, and continuously thereafter as needed;

(5) demonstrate a plan to provide the reentry services identified in paragraph (1)(C);

(6) demonstrate a plan to continue to provide services (including through referral) for individuals served by the center who move to a different geographic area to ensure appropriate case management, case planning, and access to continuous or new services, where necessary, and based on consistent reevaluation of needs;

(7) identify specific methods that the community reentry center will employ to achieve performance objectives among the individuals served by the center, including—

(A) increased access to and participation in reentry services;

(B) reduction in recidivism rates;

(C) increased numbers of individuals obtaining and retaining employment;

(D) increased enrollment in and degrees earned from educational programs, including high school or the equivalent thereof, and institutions of higher education and receipt of professional or occupational licenses;

(E) increased enrollment in vocational rehabilitation, technical schools, or vocational training;

(F) increased numbers of individuals obtaining and maintaining permanent and stable housing; and

(G) increased self-reports of successful community living, including stability of living situation and positive family relationships; and

(8) to the extent practicable, identify State, local, and private funds available to supplement the funds received under this section.

(c) **PREFERENCE.**—The Attorney General shall give preference to applicants that demonstrate that they seek to employ individuals who have been convicted of an offense, or served a term of imprisonment and have completed any court-ordered supervision, or that, to the extent allowable by law, employ such formerly incarcerated individuals in positions of responsibility.

(d) **EVALUATION AND REPORT.**—

(1) **EVALUATION.**—The Attorney General shall enter into an agreement with a nonprofit organization with expertise in analyzing data related to reentry services and recidivism to monitor and evaluate each recipient of funds under this section.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date on which grants are initially made under this section, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the program, which shall include—

(A) the number of grants made, the number of eligible entities receiving such grants, and the amount of funding distributed to each eligible entity pursuant to this section;

(B) the location of each eligible entity receiving such a grant, and the population served by the community reentry center;

(C) the number of persons who have participated in reentry services offered by a community reentry center, disaggregated by type of services, and success rates of participants in each service to the extent possible;

(D) the number of persons who have participated in reentry services for which they received a referral from a community reentry center, disaggregated by type of services, and success rates of participants in each service;

(E) recidivism rates within the population served by each community reentry center, both before and after receiving a grant under this section;

(F) the numbers of individuals obtaining and retaining employment within the population served by each community reentry center, both before and after receiving a grant under this section;

(G) the number of individuals obtaining and maintaining housing within the population served by each community reentry center, both before and after receiving a grant under this section;

(H) the number of individuals enrolled in an educational program, including high school, or the equivalent thereof, and institutions of higher education, both before and after receiving a grant under this section;

(I) the number of individuals enrolled in vocational rehabilitation, technical schools, or vocational training, both before and after receiving a grant under this section; and

(J) for each eligible entity receiving a grant under this section, the number of individuals employed who have been convicted of an offense, or served a term of imprisonment and have completed any court-ordered supervision, to include the number of formerly incarcerated individuals in positions of responsibility.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER.**—The term “community stakeholder”—

(A) means an individual who serves the community and

(B) includes—

(i) a school official;

(ii) a faith leader;

(iii) a social service provider;

(iv) a leader of a neighborhood association;

(v) a public safety representative;

(vi) an employee of an organization that provides reentry services;

(vii) a member of a civic or volunteer group related to the provision of reentry services;

(viii) a health care professional; and

(ix) an employee of a State, local, or tribal government agency with expertise in the provision of reentry services.

(2) **COMMUNITY REENTRY CENTER.**—The term “community reentry center” means a center that—

(A) offers intake, reentry needs assessments, case management, and case planning for reentry services for individuals after conviction or incarceration;

(B) provides the reentry services identified under subsection (b)(1)(C) at a single location; and

(C) provides referrals to appropriate service providers based on the assessment of needs of the individuals.

(3) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means a community-based nonprofit organization that—

(A) has expertise in the provision of reentry services; and

(B) is located in a geographic area that has disproportionately high numbers of residents, when compared to the local community, who—

(i) have been arrested;

(ii) have been convicted of a criminal offense; and

(iii) return to such geographic area after incarceration.

(4) **REENTRY SERVICES.**—The term “reentry services”—

(A) means comprehensive and holistic services that improve outcomes for individuals after conviction or incarceration; and

(B) includes—

(i) seeking and maintaining employment, including—

(I) assistance with drafting resumes, establishing emails accounts, locating job solicitations, submitting of job applications, and preparing for interviews; and

(II) securing any licenses, certifications, government-issued identifications, or other documentation necessary to obtain employment;

(ii) placement in job placement programs that partner with private employers;

(iii) obtaining free and low-cost job skills classes, including computer skills, technical skills, vocational skills, and any other job-related or other necessary skills;

(iv) supporting preparation for post-secondary education, including academic counseling, peer mentoring, and community support;

(v) locating and maintaining housing, which may include housing counseling, assisting with finding and securing affordable housing including in areas of opportunity, assisting with applications for subsidized housing and housing-related benefits, locating and identifying temporary shelter when housing cannot be found immediately and applying for home energy and utility assistance programs;

(vi) obtaining identification cards, driver's licenses, replacement Social Security cards, birth certificates, and citizenship or immigration documentation;

(vii) registering to vote, and applying for voting rights to be restored, where permitted by law;

(viii) applying for or accessing high school equivalency classes, vocational rehabilitation or technical courses;

(ix) applying for loans for and admission to institutions of higher education;

(x) financial counseling planning, empowerment or coaching;

(xi) legal assistance or referrals for record sealing or expungement, forfeiture of property or assets, family law and custody matters, legal aid services (including other civil legal aid services), and relevant civil matters including housing and other issues;

(xii) retrieving property or funds retained by the arresting agency or facility of incarceration, or retrieving property or funds obtained while incarcerated;

(xiii) transportation, including through provision of transit fare;

(xiv) individual and familial counseling;

(xv) problem-solving, in coordination with counsel where necessary, any difficulties in compliance with court-ordered supervision requirements, including restrictions on living with certain family members, contact with certain friends, bond requirements, location and residency restrictions, electronic monitoring compliance, court-ordered substance use disorder treatment, and other court-ordered requirements;

(xvi) communication needs, including providing a mobile phone, mobile phone service or access, or internet access;

(xvii) applying for State or Federal government benefits, where eligible, and assisting in locating free or reduced cost food and sustenance benefits;

(xviii) life skills assistance;

(xix) mentorship;

(xx) medical and mental health services, and cognitive-behavioral programming;

(xxi) substance use disorder treatment;

(xxii) reactivation, application for, and maintenance of professional or other licenses;

(xxiii) providing case management services, in connection with court-ordered terms of release, or other local publicly supported social work case management;

(xxiv) safety planning with victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and human trafficking; and

(xxv) applying for State Vocational Rehabilitation services for individuals with disabilities that may qualify or conduct an evaluation to determine whether they may be eligible or potentially eligible for vocational rehabilitation services.

(5) **SUCCESS RATE.**—The term “success rate” means the rate of recidivism (as measured by a subsequent conviction or return to prison), job placement, permanent housing placement, or completion of certification, trade, or other education program.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out this section.

(2) **EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that grants awarded under this section are equitably distributed among the geographical regions and between urban and rural populations, including Indian Tribes, consistent with the objective of reducing recidivism.

SEC. 3. GRANTS FOR REENTRY SERVICES ASSISTANCE HOTLINES.

(a) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General is authorized to make grants to States, Indian Tribes, and units of local government to operate reentry services assistance hotlines that are toll-free and operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

(2) **GRANT PERIOD.**—A grant made under paragraph (1) shall be for a period of not more than 5 years.

(b) **HOTLINE REQUIREMENTS.**—A grant recipient shall ensure, with respect to a hotline funded by a grant under subsection (a), that—

(1) the hotline directs individuals to local reentry services (as such term is defined in section 2(e));

(2) any personally identifiable information that an individual provides to an agency of the State or Indian Tribe through the hotline is not directly or indirectly disclosed, without the consent of the individual, to any other agency or entity, or person;

(3) the staff members who operate the hotline are trained to be knowledgeable about—

(A) applicable Federal, State, Tribal, and local reentry services; and

(B) the unique barriers to successful reentry into the community after a person has been convicted or incarcerated;

(4) the hotline is accessible to—

(A) individuals with limited English proficiency, consistent with applicable law; and

(B) individuals with disabilities;

(5) the hotline has the capability to engage with individuals using text messages.

(c) **BEST PRACTICES.**—The Attorney General shall issue guidance to grant recipients on best practices for implementing the requirements of subsection (b).

(d) **PREFERENCE.**—The Attorney General shall give preference to applicants that demonstrate that they seek to employ individuals to operate the hotline who have been convicted of an offense, or have served a term of imprisonment and have completed any court-ordered supervision.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian Tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(2) **STATE.**—The term “State” means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out this section.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117-587, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3372.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3372, the One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2021, is truly a public safe-

ty-minded bill that would create a grant program within the Department of Justice to support community reentry intake and coordination centers.

The centralized centers opened pursuant to this bill would offer those leaving incarceration the resources necessary to successfully rejoin and reintegrate into our communities through DOJ and community-funded reentry programs.

Now, let me be very clear: I am delighted that there are the kind of sensitive community efforts across America, spotty in different States and different cities, who believe in reentry. That is why we believe this legislation is so important, because it federalizes and increases the opportunity for all Americans facing the daunting responsibilities of what reentry is to have a lifeline.

There exists a great need for these programs envisioned in this legislation as more than 600,000 people return to their communities each year after serving time in State and Federal prisons, as do nearly 9 million people from county jails, while more than 2.5 million people complete parole and probation.

We can't deny these people an opportunity to be again contributing citizens in a positive way.

Individuals with criminal convictions face daunting challenges upon release. The overwhelming majority of those released from custody receive minimum preparation during their incarceration and inadequate assistance to get back on their feet after they are released.

Their convictions may limit employment prospects, educational and training opportunities, public housing assistance, and access to social services. They should not, but they do.

Even a minor criminal conviction can erect substantial barriers and trigger far-reaching collateral consequences, maybe even access to college education.

Due in part to the difficulty of overcoming these barriers, five out of six people who have spent time in a State prison will be arrested for a new crime within 9 years of their release.

We cannot waste human resources or talent in this way. That is why policies designed to improve reentry outcomes have broad bipartisan support, as demonstrated by the passage of our First Step Act and the Sentencing Reduction Act, which incentivizes education and recidivism reduction programs for people in Federal prisons.

While the First Step Act and Second Chance Act, first introduced by my good friend, DANNY DAVIS, and other initiatives have been successful at the Federal level, the majority of returning citizens are exiting State and local facilities, and there is no overall and comprehensive effort to address the challenges of reentry.

An example of the type of community reentry center supported by this legislation is in Tulsa, Oklahoma,

where community organizations offer a comprehensive model of reentry services. The services offered through the Tulsa Reentry One-Stop have significantly reduced recidivism and increased employment. In 2015, 77 percent of the individuals who successfully completed their reintegration program remained employed after exiting the program. There is the proof.

H.R. 3372 would establish a grant program to support reentry centers like Tulsa and ensure support is more available for all individuals across the Nation from the moment they are released. Support would include assistance with transportation, housing, skills training, and even advanced education.

One-stop reentry centers would also assist reentering individuals in obtaining identification and applying for eligible public benefits. Those who have formal reentry plans would be able to find case management assistance and court-directed wraparound support at the reentry centers.

This, again, would be a lifeline for a new direction, not for the individual only, but for their family, their neighbors, their neighborhood, and where they live.

In addition to the one-stop reentry centers, this bill would authorize a second mechanism to assist individuals reentering communities that do not have large enough populations of reentering individuals to maintain a standalone reentry center. In these communities, H.R. 3372 would provide grants to operate free reentry hotlines that operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to assist those recently released from incarceration with reentry services near their homes.

Madam Speaker, the Judiciary Committee has a responsibility not to look only at urban crises, urban crime, and urban solutions. We must look at the hamlets, villages, suburbia, and elsewhere. Rural communities need our assistance.

We specifically thought it was important to have this hotline to be able to assist them. This element of the bill is particularly important in our smaller communities.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle might argue that the funding authorized in the bill is too high, but we know that the high rates of recidivism equal this amount of money, leaving individuals coming out of incarceration as having nowhere to go.

□ 1245

Their actions can become more costly to Americans than our investment in changing their lives.

This bill would address a pressing nationwide need, providing individuals with the tools and support they need to successfully reenter society, ultimately making our community safer.

Now, I have had the privilege of serving alongside of Representative KAREN BASS for a number of years. I take this

moment to publicly, on behalf of her colleagues, congratulate her for her next step in life: Becoming the first woman to ever become mayor of the great city of LA.

I can say that because there is another great city, Houston.

But I give her my congratulations and I know her colleagues would do so, as well.

Representative BASS worked with leadership on this issue, as well as joining with bipartisan cosponsors. We know it has widespread support and, therefore, we are looking forward to introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3372 authorizes the Attorney General to provide grants to community-based nonprofits to operate one stop reentry centers.

The biggest problem, though, is the Department of Justice already does exactly what this bill would require it to do.

The Second Chance Act of 2007, reauthorized by Congress and signed into law by President Trump in the First Step Act of 2018, provides comprehensive assistance to individuals in transition from prison back to the community. This bill is duplicative. It is redundant, and maybe, most importantly, the Democrats know that.

Last Congress, the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held a hearing. The majority's own briefing memo for that hearing highlighted the reporting center in Somerset County, Pennsylvania. And the center said this: It was a community-based correctional program that has been designed to provide services for its participants at one location.

This is the exact type of program outlined in H.R. 3372. And indeed the center's program received a grant from the Justice Department's Bureau of Justice Assistance.

In fact, the name of that grant is Smart Supervision: Reducing Prison Populations, Saving Money, and Creating Safer Communities.

H.R. 3372 is duplicative of efforts found in the Second Chance Act under which nonprofit entities are eligible for grant funds. While we want successful reentry programs to reduce recidivism, we should not be creating duplicative and additional bureaucracy in the process.

Also, the bill encourages State, Indian Tribes, and local governments to employ sex offenders, murderers, and human traffickers, and other dangerous criminals to operate the reentry service assistance hotlines.

H.R. 3372 authorizes \$7.5 million in grants to States, Indian Tribes, and local governments to operate these reentry service assistance hotlines that direct individuals to local reentry services.

It requires the Attorney General to give preference to applicants who would employ people to operate the hotlines, "who have been convicted of an offense or have served a term of imprisonment and have completed any court-ordered supervision. But the bill provides no exceptions for violent offenders, such as sex offenders, murderers, human traffickers, and other dangerous criminals.

While it might be appropriate to employ certain offenders who have demonstrated full rehabilitation, Congress should not be incentivizing local communities to hire certain offenders who may not have been rehabbed.

What should we be doing? Spending our time, our limited time, in addressing the rampant crime epidemic in America. Cities are rejecting lenient, soft-on-crime policies and encouraging prosecutors to actually enforce the law.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, my dear friend, Ranking Member JORDAN, speaks to a particular point that I just have to respond.

I am so glad he cited positive examples of what a reentry program can do, but he is giving evidence, comfort, and advocacy for this legislation. Because isolated programs will not help Americans. We now give a broad-based opportunity for cities, hamlets, villages, and counties across America—rural and urban, North, South, East and West—to look at their landscape of those reentering and accessing this one-stop program.

We have already said 600,000 are released, and we have already said that these persons want to rehabilitate themselves. Why would anybody oppose this legislation? And it is bipartisan. Let me remind my friends that these are individuals who have served their time.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a distinguished member of the committee and the subcommittee chair.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3372, the One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act.

Every year, more than 600,000 people in the United States are released from State and Federal prisons. But even after they are released, in many ways their sentences continue.

Criminal records create unbelievable barriers to securing housing, education, employment, healthcare, and other basic necessities. And there is no Federal agency currently responsible for helping newly released people to navigate these issues.

This bill provides much-needed funding for the creation of a community-based solution to help formerly incarcerated people access vital services that will help them return to their

families and neighborhoods successfully.

As mayor of the city of Providence, I assembled a reentry council to support similar reentry programs in the city. I witnessed firsthand how such services deliver desperately needed support and effectively reduced an individual's reoffending and thereby making our communities safer and more prosperous.

That is why I am proud to support this legislation. I am confident it will help people who are exiting the criminal justice system effectively get back on their feet.

I thank Congresswoman and future Los Angeles mayor, KAREN BASS for her great leadership on this bipartisan, bicameral bill, and on so many other important issues facing our country.

Madam Mayor, you will be sorely missed in this Chamber and for your work in the Committees on the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill today.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a respected member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I voted for this bill in committee because it is a worthy objective.

Assisting prisoners to successfully reenter society, find jobs, and take their place as law-abiding citizens is essential to the safety and stability of our society.

But on further reflection, I have come to believe that this is a program that the Federal Government should not be funding through grants to local organizations.

Grants have become the third biggest expenditure of the entire Federal Government, behind only Social Security and National Defense.

We give away a half-trillion dollars a year in this manner, that is roughly \$4,000 from an average family's taxes, with little oversight, little accountability, little follow-up, and little results.

Reentry preparation should be a top priority of Federal and State prison systems. State prisons are a State responsibility. They should be funded by taxpayers of the individual States. Probation departments exist precisely to promote reentry, and the model in this bill should be considered by them.

Now, Federal prisons are our responsibility, and we also have probation services that should be striving toward implementing concepts in this bill.

If this measure funded Federal programs that expanded reentry preparation within the Federal prisons and probation system, I would strongly support it, but it doesn't. Instead, it takes the money of a taxpayer in one State and throws that money at a non-profit organization in another State with the hope that some good will come from it. And some might.

But more likely, it will disappear into the salaries of various groups who

will write glowing reports of their work and apply for more grants next year. And if for some reason the Federal Bureau of Prisons is unable to provide these services, then they should be competitively bid out to contractors with specific performance measurements and accountability.

Federal grant spending is completely out of control and it has to stop. Reckless spending—all for good causes—I have never seen a grant program that doesn't promise to do good things, but it is destroying our prosperity. That spending is driving the worst inflation in 40 years and the most ruinous debt in our Nation's history. And it is hard to find a grant program that actually delivers on its promises.

I think it is time that we began to spend taxpayers' money as carefully as they spend what they have got left after we have taxed them into debt.

This bill falls short of that responsibility.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. There lies the key element to my friends who are ignoring the fact that this one-stop legislation has bipartisan support. It means that someone who was in opposition to my party, my caucus, supports this. The work that Ms. BASS did with all of us was a bipartisan effort. And the reason is because this is an investment.

And my friends keep talking about grants. And so it is the grant that continues to be the line of argument and the—how should I say it—the bee sting. And they are wrong because grants have oversight. Grants require these organizations to apply and present the best practices, the best evidence. And so I am very glad that it is a grant. But it also gives those with broad needs across the land the fair opportunity to apply for a grant to be able to have these kinds of programs.

The one-stop model that this legislation promotes would aim to provide complete reentry services to address the critical elements of the reentry process that promote long-term reentry success, which as I said, is housing, employment, education, and healthcare.

The bill will ensure that returning citizens can effectively access the services funded through the many bills that we have tried to work on.

Now let me just be very clear. One of my good friends called off a list of offenders that really triggers fear, apprehension, and distaste. Well, those are the very individuals that we would hope that through treatment, medical care and otherwise, and getting them into a proper program, that they can be contributing, that their families do not have to be fearfully looking over their shoulder as to what have they done next. We have to try. And these programs will hire those who have a difficult time finding employment. But you can be assured that working with the program they will be screened prior to their employment; their employ-

ment will reduce their likelihood to recidivate.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely important that we take the tough questions and give good answers. Tough questions about: What do you do with those who are trying to reenter? What you do is you have a good program that is tough and that it works.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out there is nothing in the bill that requires that you screen these individuals. It says you are supposed to hire these folks with that past criminal record to answer the hotlines. That is what the bill says. If you want to amend it to say no, that they have to be screened even more before you let them answer the phones, that is not what the legislation says.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just in a moment let me indicate that you can always find just a sliver on which to oppose.

I hold in my hand a whole list of Republicans that believe the bill works and should work. So that, we should take off the table. Republicans and Democrats support this legislation.

And then I can assure you that people answering the phone will not be randomly answering the phone. They will be under a supervised program, as this program relates. We would hope and expect that they would be the kind that can listen and take the intake of those who are desperate and trying to find a way not to go back to crime.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Again, I would just point out that that is not what the legislation says. It says the Attorney General shall give preference for hiring folks, that I described in my opening statement, to answer these hotlines.

So what the gentlewoman from Texas, my friend, said is just not accurate. It doesn't reflect what is in the bill itself.

That's not the first thing she said today that is not accurate. Earlier, the gentlewoman made a statement. I wrote it down: Isolated programs will not help Americans.

How do you know?

□ 1300

Which isolated programs are you talking about?

I assume you were talking about the one I referenced in Pennsylvania that is doing exactly the same thing this bill seeks to do.

Have you checked that program out? If they don't help Americans, then whom do they help?

Are they helping illegal immigrants? I don't know.

Again, all I am saying is it is important when we have these debates we stick to the facts.

For the reasons I outlined before, Mr. Speaker, we oppose the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I always like a words game with my good friend from Ohio, so let me clarify.

An isolated program means that a program in Tulsa and a program in Pennsylvania do not help someone in Idaho. And so what this one-stop program does is it gives the good works of the people of Pennsylvania and Tulsa, it gives Americans the opportunities in cities, hamlets, urban centers, and rural hamlets the opportunity to have the same exact program and to invest in the 600,000, those who are coming out of incarceration, give them the same opportunity for ensuring that they will have that access to this program

That is what our intent was on the Judiciary Committee, and that is what the intent was on the many individuals, if you will, who were trying to craft something that will work for all of America.

Now, let me share with you, Mr. Speaker, an article titled: "To keep people from returning to jail, Mesa County follows other communities' reentry roadmap." Many people transitioning from jail or prison struggle to reenter society. So here is Mesa County's new program with housing, jobs, transportation, and mental health services.

What we simply want to do is to get this program out.

I will just share you with the story of Richard Gallegos who was locked up in the Mesa County jail for the first time at age 18. He spent the next 8 years in and out of jail—typically drug- and alcohol-related misdemeanors that sometimes led to more serious incidents, including nonviolent domestic disputes and resisting arrest. He said that at 27 he was sentenced to prison for a drug and firearms violation.

Altogether, Gallegos, was born and raised in Grand Junction and now 45 years old, has spent 5 years in State prison, and 3 years in county jail, and for the past 4 years he has been on probation. He now works at a job where he is learning masonry, a switch from the oil and gas industry work he did previously.

"I am staying honest, humble," he said. "I try not to walk with too much shame. The best thing in my favor is I have been forgiven by those I have wronged. They understand my drug addiction."

These are individuals whom we don't want to throw by the wayside. We want to make sure they get into this program.

Mr. Speaker, I include this article in the RECORD.

[From the Colorado Sun, Nov. 8, 2022]

TO KEEP PEOPLE FROM RETURNING TO JAIL, MESA COUNTY FOLLOWS OTHER COMMUNITIES' REENTRY ROADMAP

(By Sharon Sullivan)

Richard Gallegos was locked up in the Mesa County Jail for the first time at age 18. He spent the next eight years in and out of jail—typically drug and alcohol-fueled misdemeanors that sometimes led to more serious incidents, including (nonviolent) domestic disputes and resisting arrest, he said. At 27, he was sentenced to prison for a drug and firearms violation.

Altogether, Gallegos, born and raised in Grand Junction and now 45 years old, has spent five years in state prison and three years in county jail. For the past four years, he has been on probation. He now works at a job where he's learning masonry, a switch from the oil and gas industry work he did previously.

"I'm staying honest, humble," he said. "I try not to walk with too much shame. The best thing in my favor is I have been forgiven by those I've wronged. They understand drug addiction."

Gallegos shares an apartment with an adult daughter, but many formerly incarcerated friends are not so lucky, he said.

"People are coming out of jail with no resources," Gallegos said. "You better hope you have a support system. Resources are slim to none coming out of county jail."

"You're on your own, facing what put you in there in the first place. People's first thought is often, 'I want to do what's right—but where do I go?'"

Mesa County officials have long recognized that many people transitioning from jail or prison struggle with substance abuse, mental illness or both—compounding the multiple other challenges they face when reentering society, and often lacking much-needed resources like Gallegos did.

The Mesa County Sheriff's Office compared names of frequent users of the jail with frequent visitors to emergency rooms at Grand Junction's two acute care hospitals, Community Hospital and St. Mary's Medical Center. (To protect patient privacy, the two hospitals did not disclose names, but confirmed that many people appeared on both lists.) They identified 60-90 frequent users of both the jail and emergency rooms. Most of these frequent users face challenges related to mental health diagnoses or substance abuse, said Mesa County Commissioner Janet Rowland, who has led an effort to address the issue.

In September, Mesa County launched a new multiagency collaboration (county officials refer to it as MAC), aimed at helping people successfully transition from incarceration. The collaboration connects people to agencies that can assist with employment, housing, transportation and other basic needs, as well as access to mental health services or rehabilitation programs to combat drug or alcohol addictions.

REENTERING SOCIETY

In April 2021, 50 percent of people held in the Mesa County Jail were on mental health medications, Mesa County Sheriff Todd Rowell said. Mental health and/or substance abuse issues are a significant factor in recidivism rates at the jail, said Rowell. While people can receive treatment for these conditions while incarcerated, they often lack continuity of care once they leave jail and, thus, can be prone to reoffending, he said.

In 2020, when overall arrests were down due to the COVID-19 pandemic, one man was arrested 19 times, Rowell noted. A dozen other people were arrested four to eight times each.

"I was frustrated. I felt people had almost zero chance to succeed after jail," Rowell said. "Life is hard anyways, particularly after spending three months in jail. Finding work is almost impossible. It's a benefit to any county to understand those challenges to change the recidivism."

Mesa County did not have a transition coordinator at its jail until it hired Julie Mamo in 2019. She visited jails in Boulder and Douglas counties to learn about their reentry programs while creating Mesa County's program. The new multiagency collaboration builds on the program Mamo founded.

Thus far, Mesa County has enlisted three agencies to provide services to help people with reentry: Amos Counseling, a Grand Junction-based counseling service; Foundations 4 Life, an organization that provides substance use disorder and mental health services to people involved in the justice system; and the Freedom Institute, a nonprofit that offers WAGEES (Work and Gain Education and Employment Skills), a community reentry program within the Colorado Department of Corrections.

The Freedom Institute has already been providing WAGEES services for prison parolees in Grand Junction. Its new county contract now allows the Freedom Institute to offer those same services to the jail population.

Lisa Mills, Mesa County's behavioral health strategies manager, decides which agency can best meet the specific needs of a person leaving jail. Case managers are given no more than 10 clients—the goal is to meet with people daily if necessary—to ensure they are adhering to prescription medications, able to access food assistance, acquire bus passes, find employment and housing. Upon release, people are met at the jail by an agency staff member for rides to where they are staying or wherever else they need to go. The agencies work closely with the jail's two transition coordinators.

The county secured a \$400,000 grant from the Colorado Department of Human Services' Office of Behavioral Health to fund the program. St. Mary's Medical Center and the Mesa County Sheriff's Office each pitched in another \$300,000 for a total of \$1 million.

"It's a long overdue program," said Lieutenant Henry Stoffel of the Mesa County Sheriff's Office. "A lot of people leave our facility and don't have basic human needs, and so they often reoffend. We want to get them out of that cycle."

RETURNING TO PRISON FOR MINOR OFFENSES

It's taken 45-year-old Gary Swenson 20 years to get out of that cycle. His involvement with the justice system began at age 12 when he was sentenced to a Colorado juvenile detention center for a burglary he committed with a relative and two friends. By age 18 he was addicted to methamphetamine. He has spent half his life in and out of state prison.

Swenson said he found it challenging to meet his parole obligations without a reliable source of transportation. Public transit didn't exist in the Grand Valley when he needed it, and he wasn't allowed to drive until he had fulfilled parole obligations. Employers were annoyed that he asked to leave work a couple times each week to attend mandatory substance abuse classes. He also had to take time off to submit weekly urine samples for drug screenings—which he was required to pay for himself, along with the classes.

"Your employer has to be real understanding, which they're usually not," Swenson said.

He said most of his time behind bars was for parole violations, including once for receiving a speeding ticket, or on other occasions for missing those classes—all violations for which he'd be sent right back to prison.

"It was always a prison sentence," as opposed to probation or a halfway house, Swenson said.

ProPublica (a national nonprofit media outlet that receives funding from The Colorado Trust) recently reported on how easy it is to be sent back to prison for minor offenses. The number of people in Colorado who return to prison within three years is 50 percent, one of the worst recidivism rates in the nation, according to a 2018 Virginia Department of Corrections report cited by ProPublica.

Douglas County's reentry program includes a jail medication-assisted treatment program that helps people with opioid use disorder. The county had a 42 percent recidivism rate in 2021, which is lower than the statewide average, said Nicole Beckett, the jail-based behavioral health services administrator in Douglas County. Its reentry program includes working with probation officers, pretrial officers, public defenders and community behavioral health professionals.

"It's definitely our goal to disrupt the cycle of incarceration," Beckett said. "People with substance use disorders face risk of relapse, making them a challenging population to help."

Boulder County's reentry program added a housing coordinator, Kim Smith, in 2019 to focus specifically on helping people find housing in the city's extremely tight market. People on probation are prohibited from leaving Boulder County to seek more affordable housing elsewhere. With such a competitive housing market, landlords can easily choose not to rent to people with criminal records, said Smith. The reentry program has seen an 80 percent success rate of people avoiding recidivism.

Mesa County officials say reentry programs are rare in rural areas due to a lack of resources. County Sheriffs of Colorado, a nonprofit that provides programs and support to sheriffs statewide, does not track the number of counties offering transition programs.

While Mesa County Jail offers some programs in-house, it needs more space, and continuity of care has been an issue once people leave jail, Stoffel said. He would like the jail's transition program to double or triple in size, and said he expects reentry programs to increase across Colorado.

"They're in treatment for 45 days; recovery is for life," Mamo said.

READJUSTING TO LIFE

In July, Mamo launched a program similar to one she witnessed in Douglas County that helps people acquire identification cards. A Department of Motor Vehicles mobile unit comes to the jail twice a month to issue IDs.

"Most people need two forms of ID," said Lory Villumsen, a second transition coordinator hired in June. "We process the application to help with getting them their Social Security card." The transition team is additionally working on finding birth certificates for people.

Mamo has created partnerships with transitional sober living spaces, reunited people with family members who reside outside the community, and enrolled people in treatment programs—sometimes out of town. The challenges of reentry are similar, whether transitioning from jail or prison, except lengthier prison sentences often means a person has become more "institutionalized," making it more difficult to adjust to life on the outside, Mamo said.

People who are incarcerated are told when to eat, when to sleep, what to wear and what to do; "when people leave jail, we need to empower them to make all these decisions," Stoffel noted.

Freedom Institute executive director Micah Espinoza hopes that working with people leaving county jail will keep them out of prison.

"Once you're convicted of a felony, and have fulfilled your sentence, you still pay for that the rest of your life," Espinoza said. As part of the multiagency collaboration, "we're targeting people going in and out of jail for typically petty offenses. Why are they committing these crimes? It's usually poverty, homelessness, substance abuse, mental health."

Swenson said he's learned from his mistakes; he's been out of prison for almost two years and is on unsupervised probation for the first time. He works as a peer specialist for the Circle Program, a residential treatment program in Grand Junction for men age 18 and older with concurrent substance abuse and mental health disorders.

"There are people in this program I've been in prison with, gotten high with," Swenson said. "They see 'if Gary can do it,' they can. It's me not forgetting where I came from."

"Instead of locking people up for possession, give us an opportunity first to work with them," he continued. "A lot of guys don't want to be high, live on the streets, be homeless—it's just all they know. Being part of this program is a chance to see an opportunity."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. My concluding remarks include programs in Boulder County that can be done.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, once you are convicted of a felony and have fulfilled your sentence, you will still pay for the rest of your life. We need to find a way where these individuals can contribute and not be those who enter out and then go in. It is important to learn from their mistakes, but we have got to help them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the underlying legislation. Again, I thank those who cosponsored it and the main cosponsor, Congresswoman KAREN BASS.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3372, the "One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2021," is a public-safety minded bill that would create a grant program within the Department of Justice to support community reentry intake and coordination centers.

The centralized centers opened pursuant to this bill would offer those leaving incarceration the resources necessary to successfully rejoin and reintegrate into our communities through DOJ and community-funded reentry programs.

There exists a great need for the programs envisioned in this legislation, as more than 600,000 people return to their communities each year after serving time in state and federal prisons, as do nearly nine million people from county jails, while more than 2.5 million people complete parole or probation each year.

Individuals with criminal convictions face daunting challenges upon release. The overwhelming majority of those released from custody receive minimal preparation during their incarceration and inadequate assistance to get back on their feet after they are released, while their convictions may limit employment prospects, educational and training opportuni-

ties, public housing assistance, and access to social services.

Even a minor criminal conviction can erect substantial barriers and trigger far-reaching collateral consequences. Due in part to the difficulty of overcoming these barriers, five out of six people who have spent time in a state prison will be arrested for a new crime within nine years of their release.

That is why policies designed to improve reentry outcomes have broad bipartisan support, as demonstrated by passage of the First Step Act, which incentivizes education and recidivism-reduction programs for people in federal prisons.

While the First Step Act, Second Chance Act, and other initiatives have been successful at the federal level, the majority of returning citizens are exiting state and local facilities, and there is an overall need for a more comprehensive approach to address the challenges of reentry.

An example of the type of community reentry center supported by this legislation is in Tulsa, Oklahoma where community organizations offer a comprehensive model of reentry services. The services offered through the Tulsa Reentry One-Stop have significantly reduced recidivism and increased employment. In 2015, 77% of the individuals who successfully completed their reintegration program remained employed after exiting the program.

H.R. 3372 would establish a grant program to support community reentry centers like the Tulsa Reentry One-Stop and ensure support is made available for all individuals the moment they are released. Support would include assistance with transportation, housing, and skills training.

One Stop reentry centers would also assist reentering individuals in obtaining identification and applying for eligible public benefits. And those who have formal reentry plans would be able to find case management assistance and court directed, wrap-around support at the reentry centers.

In addition to the One Stop reentry centers, this bill would authorize a second mechanism to assist individuals reentering communities that do not have large enough populations of reentering individuals to maintain a standalone reentry center.

In these communities, H.R. 3372 would provide grants to operate free, reentry hotlines that operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to assist those recently released from incarceration with reentry services near their homes. This element of the bill is particularly important for rural and smaller communities.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle might argue that the funding authorized in this bill is too high. But we know that the high rates of recidivism of individuals leaving incarceration are far more costly to American communities.

This bill would address a pressing nationwide need, providing individuals with the tools and support they need to successfully reenter society, ultimately, making our communities safer.

I thank our colleague, Representative KAREN BASS, for her leadership on this issue, as well as her bipartisan cosponsors, for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Recognizing the high rates of recidivism in our communities and the lack of access to reentry resources, H.R. 3372 would establish a

new grant program within DOJ to support One Stop Community Reentry Centers.

When individuals lack access to reentry services such as housing, job training, and mental health resources, they are more like to be rearrested and reincarcerated. This bill would improve public safety by reducing recidivism.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3372, the One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2021. I am proud to support this bill and thank my good friend and fellow Californian Congresswoman BASS for her leadership, and Chairman Nadler and the Speaker for bringing this important bill to the floor.

There are currently about 2 million people living life behind bars in this country—and the devastating effects of mass incarceration go far beyond the length of a prison sentence.

The average national recidivism rate is a staggering 49.3 percent over 8 years, which is largely driven by individuals experiencing barriers to essential resources after having served their time.

This important legislation will help people get back on their feet as they reintegrate from incarceration into their communities—a step toward addressing the realities that drive mass incarceration, especially in communities of color.

We must end the vicious cycle of mass incarceration. I urge my colleagues to vote ‘yes’ on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER). All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 117-587.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 16, strike “and” at the end.

Page 8, line 21, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 8, after line 21, insert the following:

(H) other relevant information, which may include recommendations, if any, to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the grant program under this section, and to address barriers faced by individuals receiving reentry services from community reentry centers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1499, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I come today before the House first in strong support of Congresswoman BASS’ bill, the One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act.

Each year, hundreds of thousands of people are released from custody after serving their time, and reentry services

are a crucial tool to help these individuals find success when they return home.

However, in many cases, returning individuals are not given adequate support to succeed as they reintegrate in our communities. Too often they struggle to access safe and affordable housing, educational opportunities, and steady employment. This bill will provide critical, accessible, and comprehensive resources to these individuals including job training and help to obtain IDs, housing, mental health services, and more.

Importantly, this bill would also expand services that I have direct experience to know are critical to increasing the success of reentering citizens.

Prior to coming to Congress, I had the opportunity to work with returning citizens in the cutting-edge Federal reentry court started in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania by U.S. Magistrate Judge Tim Rice and now Third Circuit Judge Felipe Restrepo.

We saw in that courtroom how mentoring and legal assistance often were the key to successful reentry by returning citizens. The additional services provided by the reentry court and related nonprofits resulted in a two-thirds reduction in recidivism by participants in that program.

So in addition to supporting the underlying bill, I am proud to offer my colleague, Ms. PRESSLEY’s, amendment to the One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act.

This amendment will ensure that the grant program is evaluated for its effectiveness. We know that it is not enough to create a grant program, we must also ensure effective implementation of that program and that the critical government resources we make available are meeting the needs of the intended recipients and are a productive use of taxpayer resources.

This additional provision will require evaluation of the grant program and allow recommendations to improve the program and reduce any barriers to access.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, it requires the Department of Justice to issue a report. Seeing how the Department of Justice is already doing what is authorized in this bill, it would be kind of nice, frankly, to have this report done before we spend an additional \$59 million over the next several years.

Mr. Speaker, for the reason we outlined against the legislation itself—it is redundant, it allows people with a violent past to work at these facilities, and it actually encourages them to be the preference for answering the hotlines at these facilities, and for those reasons we are opposed to the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me rise in great enthusiasm for an important amendment that calls for an evaluation and a determination as to whether or not this is impacting positively those who are in the program.

I have already read stories about Robert and a number of others; if this program spreads across America to urban hamlets, villages, counties, and rural communities, then we need to know how effective it is.

I am almost positive it will be very effective as a worthwhile investment for the 600,000 people who are released, but this amendment will ensure that we have the right kind of amendment for best practices and best evidence.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would simply encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of Representative PRESSLEY’s amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PREGNANT WOMEN IN CUSTODY ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1499, I call up the bill (H.R. 6878) to address the health needs of incarcerated women related to pregnancy and childbirth, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1499, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 117-587, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.